

JRC TECHNICAL REPORTS

Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 12th - 15th of October 2015, Ispra (I)

*European Commission
harmonization program for Air
Quality Measurements*

Lagler F., Barbieri M., Borowiak A.

2016



This publication is a Technical report by the Joint Research Centre, the European Commission's in-house science service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policy-making process. The scientific output expressed does not imply a policy position of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

Contact information

Friedrich Lagler

Address: Joint Research Centre

Directorate for Energy, Transport and Climate

Air and Climate Unit

Via Enrico Fermi 2749, TP 120

21027 Ispra (VA)

ITALY

E-mail: Friedrich.lagler@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Tel.: +39 0332 783057

JRC Science Hub

<https://ec.europa.eu/jrc>

JRC102054

EUR 28097 EN

PDF	ISBN 978-92-79-61777-5	ISSN 1831-9424	doi: 10.2790/858971
Print	ISBN 978-92-79-61776-8	ISSN 1018-5593	doi: 10.2790/795329

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2016

© European Union, 2016

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

All images © European Union 2016

How to cite: Friedrich Lagler, Maurizio Barbieri, Annette Borowiak; Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 12-15 October 2015, Ispra; EUR 28097 EN; doi: 10.2790/795329

In collaboration with:

Thorsten Zang, Esther Heidsiek – Schmitten, Toivo Truuts, Ain Viidik, Nick Rand, Darren Lane, Gustaaf Stefess, Jan Vonk, Petra Lepri, Hrvoje Rybak, Natalija Ivanc, Ales Razpotnik, Viktor Dészi, Gabor Polay, Claus Nordstroem, Stephan Ingemann Bernberg, Mario Bilic, Zlatko Grgic.

	NAME	VERSION	DATE
AUTHOR	A. BOROWIAK, F. LAGLER, M. BARBIERE	DRAFT 1	02/05/2016
REVIEW	N. JENSEN	DRAFT 2	06/05/2016
APPROVAL	E. VIGNATI	1.0	08/07/2016

Contents

ABSTRACT	8
1. INTRODUCTION	9
2. INTER-LABORATORY ORGANIZATION	11
2.1. PARTICIPANTS	11
2.2. PREPARATION OF TEST MIXTURES	13
3. THE EVALUATION OF LABORATORY'S MEASUREMENT PROFICIENCY	14
3.1. Z' - SCORE	14
3.2. E _N - SCORE	18
4. PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL LABORATORIES	24
4.1. CONVERTER EFFICIENCIES OF NO ₂ -TO-NO FOR NO _x ANALYZERS	24
5. DISCUSSION	26
6. CONCLUSIONS	28
7. REFERENCES	30
<i>Annex A. Assigned values</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Annex B. The results of the IE</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Annex C. The precision of standardized measurement methods</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Annex D. The scrutiny of results for consistency and outlier test</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Annex E. Accreditation certificate</i>	<i>62</i>

List of tables

TABLE 1: LIST OF PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS.	11
TABLE 2: LIST OF INSTRUMENTS USED BY PARTICIPANTS.	12
TABLE 3: SEQUENCE PROGRAM OF GENERATED TEST GASES WITH INDICATIVE POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS.....	13
TABLE 4: STANDARD DEVIATION FOR PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (σ_p).....	15
TABLE 5: POOR AND QUESTIONABLE RESULTS ACCORDING TO Z'-SCORE.....	15
TABLE 6: UNSATISFACTORY RESULTS ACCORDING TO E _N -SCORE.	18
TABLE 7: EFFICIENCY OF NO ₂ -TO-NO CONVERTERS	25
TABLE 8: GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF PROFICIENCY RESULTS.....	27
TABLE 9: FLAGS SUMMARY.....	28
TABLE 10: Z'-SCORE SUMMARY	29
TABLE 11: VALIDATION OF ASSIGNED VALUES (X)	34
TABLE 12: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 0.	36
TABLE 13: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 1.	37
TABLE 14: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 2.	37
TABLE 15: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 3.	38
TABLE 16: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 4.	38
TABLE 17: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO₂ RUN 5.	39
TABLE 18: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 0.	40
TABLE 19: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 1.	40
TABLE 20: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 2.	41
TABLE 21: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 3.	41
TABLE 22: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 4.	42
TABLE 23: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 5.	42
TABLE 24: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 0.	43
TABLE 25: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 1.....	43
TABLE 26: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 2.	44
TABLE 27: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 3.	44
TABLE 28: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 4.	45
TABLE 29: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 5.	45
TABLE 30: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 0.....	46
TABLE 31: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 1.....	46
TABLE 32: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 2.....	47
TABLE 33: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 3.....	47
TABLE 34: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 4.....	48
TABLE 35: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 5.....	48
TABLE 36: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 6.....	49
TABLE 37: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 7.....	49
TABLE 38: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 8.....	50
TABLE 39: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 9.....	50
TABLE 40: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 10.....	51
TABLE 41: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 0.	52
TABLE 42: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 2.	52
TABLE 43: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 4.	53
TABLE 44: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 6.	53
TABLE 45: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 8.	54
TABLE 46: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 10.	54
TABLE 47: CRITICAL VALUES OF T USED IN THE REPEATABILITY (R) AND REPRODUCIBILITY (R) EVALUATION.	55
TABLE 48: THE R AND R OF SO ₂ STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD.....	56
TABLE 49: THE R AND R OF CO STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD.....	57
TABLE 50: THE R AND R OF O ₃ STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD.	58
TABLE 51: THE R AND R OF NO STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD.	59
TABLE 52: THE R AND R OF NO ₂ STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD.....	60
TABLE 53: "GENUINE" STATISTICAL OUTLIERS ACCORDING TO GRUBB'S ONE OUTLYING OBSERVATION TEST.	61
TABLE 54: STRAGGLERS ACCORDING TO GRUBB'S ONE OBSERVATION TEST.	61

List of figures

FIGURE 1: Z'-SCORE EVALUATIONS OF SO ₂ MEASUREMENTS	15
FIGURE 2: Z'-SCORE EVALUATIONS OF CO MEASUREMENTS	16
FIGURE 3: Z'-SCORE EVALUATIONS OF O ₃ MEASUREMENTS.....	16
FIGURE 4: Z'-SCORE EVALUATIONS OF NO MEASUREMENTS	17
FIGURE 5: Z'-SCORE EVALUATIONS OF NO ₂ MEASUREMENTS	17
FIGURE 6: BIAS OF PARTICIPANT'S SO ₂ MEASUREMENT RESULTS.....	19
FIGURE 7: BIAS OF PARTICIPANT'S CO MEASUREMENT RESULTS.....	20
FIGURE 8: BIAS OF PARTICIPANT'S O ₃ MEASUREMENT RESULTS	21
FIGURE 9: BIAS OF PARTICIPANT'S NO MEASUREMENT RESULTS	22
FIGURE 10: BIAS OF PARTICIPANT'S NO ₂ MEASUREMENT RESULTS	23
FIGURE 11: BIAS OF PARTICIPANT'S NO ₂ MEASUREMENTS WITH ERROR BARS REPRESENTING EXPANDED UNCERTAINTY FOR RUN NUMBERS 1, 3, 5, 7 AND 9. WITHIN THESE TEST GAS MIXTURES THERE IS NO GAS PHASE TITRATION TO PRODUCE NO ₂ (SEE TABLE 3). FOR EACH EVALUATION THE RUN NUMBER TOGETHER WITH THE PARTICIPANTS ROUNDED RUN AVERAGE (NMOL/MOL) IS GIVEN.	24
FIGURE 12: DECISION DIAGRAM FOR GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF PROFICIENCY RESULTS.	26
FIGURE 13: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 0.....	36
FIGURE 14: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 1.....	37
FIGURE 15: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 2.....	37
FIGURE 16: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 3.....	38
FIGURE 17: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 4.....	38
FIGURE 18: REPORTED VALUES FOR SO ₂ RUN 5.....	39
FIGURE 19: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 0.....	40
FIGURE 20: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 1.....	40
FIGURE 21: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 2.....	41
FIGURE 22: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 3.....	41
FIGURE 23: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 4.....	42
FIGURE 24: REPORTED VALUES FOR CO RUN 5.....	42
FIGURE 25: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 0.	43
FIGURE 26: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 1.	43
FIGURE 27: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 2.	44
FIGURE 28: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 3.	44
FIGURE 29: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 4.	45
FIGURE 30: REPORTED VALUES FOR O ₃ RUN 5.	45
FIGURE 31: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 0.	46
FIGURE 32: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 1.	46
FIGURE 33: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 2.	47
FIGURE 34: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 3.	47
FIGURE 35: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 4.	48
FIGURE 36: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 5.	48
FIGURE 37: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 6.	49
FIGURE 38: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 7.	49
FIGURE 39: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 8.	50
FIGURE 40: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 9.	50
FIGURE 41: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO RUN 10.	51
FIGURE 42: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 0.....	52
FIGURE 43: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 2.....	52
FIGURE 44: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 4.....	53
FIGURE 45: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 6.....	53
FIGURE 46: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 8.....	54
FIGURE 47: REPORTED VALUES FOR NO ₂ RUN 10.....	54
FIGURE 48: THE R AND R OF SO ₂ STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD AS A FUNCTION OF CONCENTRATION.	56
FIGURE 49: THE R AND R OF CO STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD AS A FUNCTION OF CONCENTRATION.	57
FIGURE 50: THE R AND R OF O ₃ STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD AS A FUNCTION OF CONCENTRATION.	58
FIGURE 51: THE R AND R OF NO STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD AS A FUNCTION OF CONCENTRATION.	59
FIGURE 52: THE R AND R OF NO ₂ STANDARD MEASUREMENT METHOD AS A FUNCTION OF CONCENTRATION.....	60

Abbreviations

AQUILA	Network of National Reference Laboratories for Air Quality
CO	Carbon monoxide
DQO	Data Quality Objective
ERLAP	European Reference Laboratory of Air Pollution
EC	European Commission
GPT	Gas Phase Titration
IE	Inter-laboratory Comparison Exercise
IES	Institute for Environment and Sustainability
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
JRC	Joint Research Centre
NO	Nitrogen monoxide
NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
NO _x	The oxides of nitrogen, the sum of NO and NO ₂
NRL	National Reference Laboratory
O ₃	Ozone
SO ₂	Sulphur dioxide
CRM	Certified Reference Material
WHO-CC	World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Air Quality Management and Air Pollution Control, Berlin

Mathematical Symbols

<i>symbol</i>	<i>explanation</i>
α	converter efficiency (EN 14211)
E_n	E_n – score statistic (ISO 13528)
r	repeatability limit (ISO 5725)
R	reproducibility limit (ISO 5725)
σ_p	standard deviation for proficiency assessment (ISO 13528)
x^*	robust average (Annex C ISO 13528)
s^*	robust standard deviation (Annex C ISO 13528)
s_r	repeatability standard deviation (ISO 5725)
s_R	reproducibility standard deviation (ISO 5725)
$U_{X'}$	expanded uncertainty of the assigned/reference value (ISO 13528)
U_{xi}	expanded uncertainty of the participant's value
$u_{X'}$	standard uncertainty of the assigned/reference value (ISO 13528)
X	assigned/reference value (ISO 13528)
x_i	average of three values reported by the participant i (for particular parameter and concentration level) (ISO 5725)
$x_{i,j}$	j -the reported value of participant i (for particular parameter and concentration level) (ISO 5725)
z'	z' -score statistic (ISO 13528)

Abstract

Within the harmonization program of Air Quality monitoring in Europe, the European Reference Laboratory of Air Pollution (ERLAP) is organizing Inter-Laboratory Comparison Exercises (IE). From the 12th to the 15th of October 2015, nine Laboratories of AQUILA (Network of European Air Quality Reference Laboratories) met for a laboratory comparison exercise in Ispra (IT) to evaluate their proficiency in the analysis of inorganic gaseous pollutants (NO, NO₂, SO₂, CO and O₃) covered by the European Air Quality Directive 2008/50 EC [1] and recent revision 2015/1480/EC [42].

The proficiency evaluation, where each participant's bias was compared to two criteria, provides information on the current situation and capabilities to the European Commission and can be used by participants in their quality control system.

On the basis of criteria imposed by the European Commission, 90.2% of the results reported by AQUILA laboratories were good both in terms of measured values and reported uncertainties. Part of the results (9.2%) had good measured values, but the reported uncertainties were either too high (7.6%) or too small (1.6%). Two measurements showed a questionable result (0.6%), no unsatisfactory results were submitted. Comparability of results among AQUILA participants at the highest generated concentration levels is satisfactory for measurements of all pollutants.

1. Introduction

The Directive 2008/50/EC [1] on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe sets a framework for a harmonized air quality assessment in Europe.

One important objective of the Directive [1] is that the ambient air quality shall be assessed on the basis of common methods and criteria. It deals with the air pollutants sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and monoxide (NO), particulate matter, lead, benzene, carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone (O₃). Among others it specifies the reference methods for measurements and Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) for the accuracy of measurements.

The European Commission (EC) has supported the development and publication of reference measurement methods for CO [2], SO₂ [3], NO-NO₂ [4] and O₃ [5] as European standards. Appropriate calibration methods [6], [7] and [8] have been standardized by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

As foreseen in the Air Quality Directive, the European Reference Laboratory of Air Pollution (ERLAP) of the Institute for Environment and Sustainability (IES) at the Joint Research Centre (JRC) organizes inter-laboratory comparison exercises (IE) to assess and improve the status of comparability of measurements of National Reference Laboratories (NRL) of the Member States of the European Union.

The World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Air Quality Management and Air Pollution Control, Berlin (WHO CC) is carrying out similar activities since 1994 [9] [10], [24], [31], [33], [35] and [38] but with a view to obtaining harmonized air quality data for health related studies. Their program integrates within the WHO EURO region, which includes public health institutes and other national institutes - especially from the Central Eastern Europe, Caucasus and countries from Central Asia.

Starting in 2004, it has been decided to bring together the efforts of both the JRC-ERLAP and WHO CC and to coordinate activities as far as possible, with a view to optimize resources and have better international harmonization.

The following report deals with the IE that took place from 12th to the 15th of October 2015 in Ispra (IT).

Since 1990 ERLAP organizes IEs aiming at evaluating the comparability of measurements carried out by NRLs and promoting information exchange among the expert laboratories. Currently, a more systematic approach has been adopted, in accordance with the Network of National Reference Laboratories for Air Quality (AQUILA) [11], aiming both at providing an alert mechanism for the purposes of the EC legislation and at supporting the implementation of quality schemes by NRLs.

The methodology for the organization of IEs was developed by ERLAP in collaboration with AQUILA and is described in a paper on the organization of laboratory comparison exercises for gaseous air pollutants [12].

This evaluation scheme was adopted by AQUILA in December 2008 and is applied to all IEs since then. It contains common criteria to alert the EC on possible performance failures which do not rely solely on the uncertainty claimed by participants. The evaluation scheme implements the z'-score method [13] with the uncertainty requirements for calibration gases stated in the European standards [2], [3], [4] and [5], which are consistent with the DQOs of European Directives.

According to the above mentioned document, NRLs with an overall unsatisfactory performance in the z'-score evaluation (one unsatisfactory or two questionable results per parameter) ought to repeat their participation in the following IE in order to demonstrate remediation measures [12]. In addition, considering that the evaluation scheme should be useful to participants for accreditation according to ISO 17025, they are requested to include their measurement uncertainty. Hence, participants' results

(measurement values and uncertainties) are compared to the assigned values applying the E_n – score method [13].

Beside the proficiency of participating laboratories, the repeatability and reproducibility of standardized measurement methods [14], [15] and [16] are evaluated as well. These group evaluations are useful indicators of trends in measurement quality over different IEs.

2. Inter-laboratory organization

The IE was announced in June 2015 to the members of the AQUILA network and the WHO CC representative. Registration was opened in September 2015 and closed at the beginning of October 2015.

The participants were required to bring their own measurement instruments, data acquisition equipment and travelling standards (to be used for calibrations or checks during the IE).

The participants were invited to arrive on Monday, 12th of October 2015, for the installation of their equipment. The calibration of NO_x and O₃ analysers was carried out on Tuesday morning and the generation of NO_x and O₃ gas mixtures started at 11:00. The calibration of SO₂ and CO analysers was carried out on Wednesday afternoon and the generation of CO and SO₂ gas mixtures started at 20:00.

The test gases generation and measurements finished on Thursday at 9:00.

2.1. Participants

All participants were organizations dealing with the routine ambient air monitoring or institutions involved in environmental or public health protection. The national representatives came from Germany, Estonia, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Croatia, Slovenia, Hungary and Denmark.

Country	Laboratory	Code
Germany	Landesamt für Natur, Umwelt und Verbraucherschutz (LANUV)	A
Estonia	Estonian Environmental Research Centre (EERC)	B
United Kingdom	Ricardo AEA Technology (AEA)	C
Netherlands	National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)	D
Croatia	Meteorological and Hydrological Service (DHZ)	E
Slovenia	Environment Agency of Republic of Slovenia (SEA)	F
European Commission	European Reference Laboratory for Air Pollution (ERLAP)	G
Hungary	Hungarian Meteorological Service (HMS)	H
Denmark	National Environmental Research Institute (NERI)	I
Croatia	Energy and Environmental Research Institute (EKONERG)	L

Table 1: List of participating organizations.

In Table 2 are reported the manufacturer and model of the instrumentation used by every participant during the inter-laboratory comparison exercise including those used in the calculation of the assigned values.

As a whole, the instrumentation was manufactured by 4 different companies for all parameters analyzed.

The list contains the information reported by participants and by no means can be considered as an implicit or explicit endorsement of the organizers to any specific type of instrumentation.

Gas	Lab Code	Instrument
SO ₂	A	Environnement SA, 2009, AF21 M
	B	Horiba, 2000, APSA 360
	C	Thermo 43i, 2012
	D	Thermo 43i, 2009
	E	Thermo Scientific, 2014, 43i TLE
	F	Horiba, 2002, APSA 360A
	G	Thermo Scientific, 2005, 43C-TL
	H	Thermo TE43i
	I	Teledyne API, T-100
	L	HORIBA, 2014, APSA 370
NO _x	A	Thermo, 2014, TE42i and Env. SA, 2013, AC32M
	B	Horiba, 2000, APNA 360
	C	Thermo 42i, 2010
	D	Teledyne API, 2006, 200 E
	E	Horiba, 2011, APNA 370
	F	Horiba, 2010, APNA 370
	G	Thermo Electron Corporation, 2014, 42i
	H	Thermo 48i
	I	Teledyne API, T-200
	L	Horiba, 2014, APNA 370
CO	A	Thermo, 2009, TE 48i and Env. SA, 1997, CO11M
	B	Horiba, 2000, APMA 360
	C	API 300-E
	D	Thermo, 2009, 48i TLE
	E	Horiba, 2011, APMA 370
	F	Horiba, 2013, APMA 370
	G	Horiba, 2010, APMA-370
	H	Teledyne API, T-300
	I	Teledyne API, T-300
	L	HORIBA, 2010, APMA 370
O ₃	A	Horiba, 2009, APOA 370 and Env. SA, 2009, O3 41M
	B	Horiba, 2013, 370
	C	Thermo 49i, 2010
	D	Theromo 49i, 2006
	E	Thermo Scientific, 2012, 49i
	F	Thermo, 1999, 49C
	G	Thermo Scientific 49-iPS , 2015
	H	TE 49i
	I	Teledyne API T-400
	L	HORIBA, 2008, APOA 370

Table 2: List of instruments used by participants.

2.2. Preparation of test mixtures

The ERLAP IE facility has been described in several reports [17], [18]. During this IE, gas mixtures were prepared for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ at concentration levels around limit values, critical levels and assessment thresholds set by the European Air Quality Directive [1].

The test mixtures were prepared by the dilution of gases from cylinders containing high concentrations of NO, SO₂ or CO using thermal mass flow controllers [8]. O₃ was added using an ozone generator and NO₂ was produced applying the gas phase titration method [19] in a condition of NO excess.

The participants were required to report three half-hour-mean measurements for each concentration level (run) in order to evaluate the repeatability of standardized measurement methods. Zero concentration levels were generated for one hour and one half-hour-mean measurement was reported. The sequence program of generated test gases is given in Table 3.

day	start time	duration	parameter	installation	calibration	Zero Air	NO	NO ₂	O ₃	CO	SO ₂
		h				nmol/mol	nmol/mol	nmol/mol	nmol/mol	mmol/mol	nmol/mol
1st	9:00	5	/	X							
2nd	8:00	3	/		X						
2nd	11:00	1	NO-NO ₂ -O ₃			0					
2nd	12:00	2	NO-NO ₂				600				
2nd	14:00	2	NO-NO ₂				450	150			
2nd	16:00	2	O ₃						150		
2nd	18:00	2	NO-NO ₂				210				
2nd	20:00	2	NO-NO ₂				100	110			
2nd	22:00	2	O ₃						120		
3rd	0:00	2	NO-NO ₂				80				
3rd	2:00	2	NO-NO ₂				20	60			
3rd	4:00	2	O ₃						55		
3rd	6:00	2	NO-NO ₂				390				
3rd	8:00	2	NO-NO ₂				300	90			
3rd	10:00	2	O ₃						90		
3rd	12:00	2	NO-NO ₂				50				
3rd	14:00	2	NO-NO ₂				30	20			
3rd	16:00	2	O ₃						15		
3rd	< 18:00	2	calibration		X						
3rd	20:00	1	CO-SO ₂			0					
3rd	21:00	2	CO-SO ₂							8.5	130
3rd	23:00	2	CO-SO ₂							3.5	70
4th	1:00	1	CO-SO ₂	Zero Air not reported						0	0
4th	2:00	2	CO-SO ₂							1	5
4th	4:00	2	CO-SO ₂							5	30
4th	6:00	2	CO-SO ₂							2	10
4th	8:00	1				0					
4th	9:00	END									

Table 3: Sequence program of generated test gases with indicative pollutant concentrations

3. The evaluation of laboratory's measurement proficiency

To evaluate the participant's measurement proficiency the methodology described in ISO 13528 [13] was applied. It has been agreed among the AQUILA members to take the measurement results of ERLAP as the assigned/reference values for the whole IE [12].

The traceability of ERLAP's measurement results and the method applied to validate them are presented in Annex A. In the following proficiency evaluations, the uncertainty of test gas homogeneity (Annex A) was added to the uncertainties of ERLAP's measurement results.

All data reported by participating laboratories are presented in Annex B.

As it is described in the position paper [12], the proficiency of the participants was assessed by calculating two performance indicators.

The first performance indicator (z'-score) tests whether the difference between the participants measured value and the assigned/reference value remains within the limits of a common criterion.

The second performance indicator (E_n-score) tests if the difference between the participants measured values and assigned/reference value remains within the limits of a criterion, that is calculated individually for each participant, from the uncertainty of the participants measurement result and the uncertainty of the assigned/reference value.

3.1. z' – score

The z'- score statistic is calculated according to ISO 13528 [13] as:

$$z' = \frac{x_i - X}{\sqrt{\sigma_p^2 + u_x^2}} = \frac{x_i - X}{\sqrt{(a \cdot X + b)^2 + u_x^2}} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

where 'x_i' is a participant's average value for each run, 'X' is the assigned/reference value, 'σ_p' is the 'standard deviation for proficiency assessment' and 'u_x' is the standard uncertainty of the assigned value. For 'a' and 'b' see Table 4.

In the European standards [2], [3], [4] and [5] the uncertainties for calibration gases used in ongoing quality control are prescribed. In fact, it is stated that the maximum permitted expanded uncertainty for calibration gases is 5% and that 'zero gas' shall not give instrument reading higher than the detection limit. As one of the tasks of NRLs is to supply calibration gas mixtures, the 'standard deviation for proficiency assessment' (σ_p) [13] is calculated in fitness-for-purpose manner from requirements given in European standards.

Over the whole measurement range σ_p is calculated by linear interpolation between 2.5% at the calibration point (75% of calibration range) and the limit of detection at zero concentration level. The limits of detection of studied measurement methods were evaluated from the data of previous IEs. The linear function parameters of σ_p are given in Table 4:

Gas	$\sigma_p = a \cdot c + b$	
	a	b nmol/mol
SO ₂	0.022	1
CO	0.024	100
O ₃	0.020	1
NO	0.024	1
NO ₂	0.020	1

Table 4: Standard deviation for proficiency assessment (σ_p).

σ_p is a linear function of concentration (c) with parameters: slope (a) and intercept (b).

The assessment of results in the z'-score evaluation is made according to the following criteria:

- $|z'| \leq 2$ are considered satisfactory.
- $2 < |z'| \leq 3$ are considered questionable.
- $|z'| > 3$ are considered unsatisfactory. Scores falling in this range are very unusual and are taken as evidence that an anomaly has occurred that should be investigated and corrected.

The results of z'-score evaluation are presented in bar plots (Figure 1 to Figure 5) in which the z'-scores of each participant are grouped together, and assessment criteria are presented as $z' = \pm 2$ and $z' = \pm 3$ lines.

Parameter	Lab Code	Value	Run	Z'	Z' evaluation
CO	A	-0.225	0	-2.3	questionable
CO	C	3.162	2	-2.12	questionable

Table 5: Poor and Questionable results according to Z'-score




Figure 1: Z'-score evaluations of SO₂ measurements

Scores are given for each participant and each tested concentration level (run). Run number order (with nominal concentration) is: 0 (0 nmol/mol), 1 (130 nmol/mol), 2 (70 nmol/mol), 3 (5 nmol/mol), 4 (30 nmol/mol), 5 (10 nmol/mol). The assessment criteria are presented as $z' = \pm 2$ (blue line) and $z' = \pm 3$ (red line). They represent the limits for the questionable and unsatisfactory results.



Figure 2: Z'-score evaluations of CO measurements

Scores are given for each participant and each tested concentration level (run). Run number order (with nominal concentration) is: 0 (0 µmol/mol), 1 (8.5 µmol/mol), 2 (3.5 µmol/mol), 3 (1 µmol/mol), 4 (5 µmol/mol), 5 (2 µmol/mol). The assessment criteria are presented as $z'=\pm 2$ (blue line) and $z'=\pm 3$ (red line). They represent the limits for the questionable and unsatisfactory results.




Figure 3: Z'-score evaluations of O₃ measurements

Scores are given for each participant and each concentration level (run). Run number order (with nominal concentration) is: 0 (0 nmol/mol), 1 (150 nmol/mol), 2 (120 nmol/mol), 3 (55 nmol/mol), 4 (90 nmol/mol), 5 (15 nmol/mol). The assessment criteria are presented as $z'=\pm 2$ (blue line) and $z'=\pm 3$ (red line). They represent the limits for the questionable and unsatisfactory results.



Figure 4: Z'-score evaluations of NO measurements

Scores are given for each participant and each tested concentration level (run). Run number order (with nominal concentration) is: 0 (0 nmol/mol), 1 (600 nmol/mol), 2 (450 nmol/mol), 3 (210 nmol/mol), 4 (100 nmol/mol), 5 (80 nmol/mol), 6 (20 nmol/mol), 7 (390 nmol/mol), 8 (300 nmol/mol), 9 (50 nmol/mol), 10 (30 nmol/mol). The assessment criteria are presented as $z'=\pm 2$ (blue line) and $z'=\pm 3$ (red line). They represent the limits for the questionable and unsatisfactory results.




Figure 5: Z'-score evaluations of NO₂ measurements

Scores are given for each participant and each concentration level (run). Run number order (with nominal concentration) is: 0 (0 nmol/mol), 1 (150 nmol/mol), 2 (110 nmol/mol), 3 (60 nmol/mol), 4 (90 nmol/mol), 5 (20 nmol/mol). The assessment criteria are presented as $z'=\pm 2$ (blue line) and $z'=\pm 3$ (red line). They represent the limits for the questionable and unsatisfactory results.

3.2. E_n - score

The normalized deviations [13] (E_n) were calculated according to:

$$E_n = \frac{x_i - X}{\sqrt{U_{x_i}^2 + U_X^2}} \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

where 'X' is the assigned/reference value with an expanded uncertainty ' U_X ' and ' x_i ' is the participant's average value with an expanded uncertainty ' U_{x_i} '. Satisfactory results are the ones for which $|E_n| \leq 1$.

In Figure 6 to Figure 10 the bias of each participant ($x_i - X$) are plotted and error bars are used to show the value of denominator of equation 2 ($\sqrt{U_{x_i}^2 + U_X^2}$). These plots represent also the E_n -score evaluations where, considering the E_n criterion ($|E_n| \leq 1$), all results with error bars touching or crossing the x-axis are satisfactory. Reported standard uncertainties (Annex B) that are bigger than "standard deviation for proficiency assessments" (σ_p , Table 4) are considered not fit-for-purpose and are denoted with "*" in the x-axis of each figure. The E_n evaluation showed few unsatisfactory results for different parameters and concentrations, as reported in table 6.

Parameter	Lab Code	Value	Run	En	En evaluation
SO ₂	A	128.6	SO2_1	-1.4	unsatisfactory
CO	C	8.305	CO_1	-1.2	unsatisfactory
CO	C	3.162	CO_2	-1.9	unsatisfactory
CO	C	4.711	CO_4	-1.7	unsatisfactory
CO	C	1.811	CO_5	-1.2	unsatisfactory
NO	H	103.9	NO_4	1.1	unsatisfactory

Table 6: Unsatisfactory results according to E_n - score.




Figure 6: Bias of participant's SO₂ measurement results

Expanded uncertainty of bias for each run is presented as error bar. The results with error bars touching or crossing the x-axis are satisfactory. For each evaluation the run number (numbers 0 to 5) together with the participants rounded run average (nmol/mol) is given. The '*' mark indicates reported standard uncertainties bigger than σ_p .




Figure 7: Bias of participant's CO measurement results

Expanded uncertainty of bias for each run is presented as error bar. Results with error bars touching or crossing the x-axis are satisfactory. For each evaluation the run number (numbers 0 to 5) together with the participants rounded run average (μmol/mol) is given. The '*' mark indicates reported standard uncertainties bigger than σ_p .




Figure 8: Bias of participant's O₃ measurement results

Expanded uncertainty of bias for each run is presented as error bar. Results with error bars touching or crossing the x-axis are satisfactory. For each evaluation the run number (numbers 0 to 5) together with the participants rounded run average (nmol/mol) is given. The '*' mark indicates reported standard uncertainties bigger than σ_p .




Figure 9: Bias of participant's NO measurement results

Expanded uncertainty of bias for each run is presented as error bar. Results with error bars touching or crossing the x-axis are satisfactory. For each evaluation the run number (numbers 0 to 10) together with the participants rounded run average (nmol/mol) is given. The '*' mark indicates reported standard uncertainties bigger than σ_p .




Figure 10: Bias of participant's NO₂ measurement results

Expanded uncertainty of bias is presented as error bar for NO₂ run numbers 0, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 (see Table 3). Results with error bars touching or crossing the x-axis are satisfactory. For each evaluation the run number together with the participants rounded run average (nmol/mol) is given. The '*' mark indicates reported standard uncertainties bigger than σ_p .

4. Performance characteristics of individual laboratories

Individual participants' bias were evaluated and are presented in chapter 3.2 (Figure 6-Figure 10). Since the results of NO₂ runs 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 were not treated in proficiency evaluation the bias of these runs are presented in Figure 11.




Figure 11: Bias of participant's NO₂ measurements with error bars representing expanded uncertainty for run numbers 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9. Within these test gas mixtures there is no gas phase titration to produce NO₂ (see Table 3). For each evaluation the run number together with the participants rounded run average (nmol/mol) is given.

4.1. Converter efficiencies of NO₂-to-NO for NO_x analyzers

Since NO and NO₂ test gases were produced by gas phase titration it is possible to evaluate the efficiency of the NO₂-to-NO converter of each participant's NO_x analyser. The evaluation takes each participant's NO and NO₂ measurements before and after oxidation by O₃. However, possible minor instabilities in the preparation of the test gas mixtures were not taken into account. The converter efficiency (α) is calculated using Equation 3 [4]:

$$\alpha = \frac{[NO_2]_i - [NO_2]_{i-1}}{[NO]_{i-1} - [NO]_i} \cdot 100\% \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

Ideal value for α is 100%.

The evaluation of equation 3 for each participant at different concentration levels are given in Table 7, "n.r. means "not reported" (due to missing data).

Lab code	NO ₂ nmol/mol	α (%)
A	150	99.7
A	110	99.4
A	60	99.7
A	90	100.6
A	20	99.0
B	150	99.8
B	110	99.5
B	60	99.9
B	90	100.0
B	20	99.1
C	150	100.5
C	110	97.7
C	60	99.5
C	90	99.4
C	20	97.9
D	150	90.0
D	110	99.4
D	60	100.0
D	90	100.2
D	20	89.1
E	150	99.3
E	110	98.7
E	60	99.5
E	90	99.4
E	20	98.4
F	150	99.3
F	110	99.4
F	60	99.7
F	90	99.7
F	20	100.1
G	150	99.6
G	110	99.1
G	60	99.9
G	90	99.3
G	20	100.0
H	150	102.1
H	110	101.0
H	60	99.4
H	90	101.1
H	20	99.2
I	150	n.r.
I	110	n.r.
I	60	n.r.
I	90	n.r.
I	20	n.r.
L	150	n.r.
L	110	n.r.
L	60	n.r.
L	90	n.r.
L	20	n.r.

Table 7: Efficiency of NO₂-to-NO converters

5. Discussion

For a general assessment of the quality of each result a decision diagram was developed (Figure 12) that results in seven categories (1 to 7). The general comments for each category are:

- **1:** measurement result is completely satisfactory
- **2:** measurement result is satisfactory (z'-score satisfactory and En-score ok) but the reported uncertainty is too high
- **3:** measured value is satisfactory (z'-score satisfactory) but the reported uncertainty is underestimated (En-score not ok)
- **4:** measurement result is questionable (z'-score questionable) but due to a high reported uncertainty can be considered valid (En-score ok)
- **5:** measurement result is questionable (z'-score questionable and En-score not ok)
- **6:** measurement result is unsatisfactory (z'-score unsatisfactory) but due to a high reported uncertainty can be considered valid (En-score ok)
- **7:** measurement result is unsatisfactory (z'-score unsatisfactory and En-score not ok)




Figure 12: Decision diagram for general assessment of proficiency results.

The results of the IE were assigned to categories according to the diagram given in Figure 12 and are presented in the following Table 8.

	run num	Ref. conc.	IE code								
			A	B	C	D	E	F	H	I	L
CO ($\mu\text{mol/mol}$)	0	0.006	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	1	8.555	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
	2	3.556	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
	3	1.038	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	4	5.066	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
	5	2.043	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
NO (nmol/mol)	0	-0.20	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	1	621.36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
	2	466.85	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
	3	217.03	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	4	101.11	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1
	5	80.69	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	6	19.18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	7	405.28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	8	311.55	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	9	50.26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	10	29.85	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NO ₂ (nmol/mol)	0	-0.03	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
	2	157.72	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
	4	116.09	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
	6	61.94	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
	8	95.25	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
	10	20.60	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
O ₃ (nmol/mol)	0	0.00	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
	1	152.23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	123.45	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	3	55.59	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	4	91.58	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	5	17.08	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
SO ₂ (nmol/mol)	0	0.02	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	1	134.44	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	72.63	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	3	5.25	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	4	31.26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	5	10.38	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 8: General assessment of proficiency results.

6. Conclusions

The proficiency evaluation scheme has provided an assessment of the participants measured values and their evaluated uncertainties.

In terms of the criteria imposed by the European Directive (σ_p) 90.2% of the results reported during this IE (see Table 9) by AQUILA laboratories fall into category '1' and are satisfactory both in terms of measured values and evaluated uncertainties. Among the remaining results the majority presented satisfactory measured values, but the evaluated uncertainties were either too high, category '2' (7.6 %), or too small, category '3' (1.6%). One result was found to be questionable for the z'-score but fine for the En - score (0.3% in category '4'), another one questionable for both the En - score and the z'-score (0.3% in category '5').

IE	Site	Categories %						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Apr-08	Ispra (IT)	68.4	18.1	7.3	1.0	1.0	2.6	1.6
Oct-08 (I)	Ispra (IT)	37.9	40.8	14.2	0.6	3.6	1.0	1.9
Oct-08 (II)	Ispra (IT)	34.3	38.9	23.7	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Sep-09	Langen (DE)	60.8	29.9	3.1	4.1	1.0	1.0	0.0
Oct-09	Ispra (IT)	85.0	5.7	7.5	0.4	1.4	0.0	0.0
Jun-10	Ispra (IT)	84.6	8.1	4.4	0.7	2.3	0.0	0.0
Sep-11	Ispra (IT)	86.1	7.9	5.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
Oct-11 (I)	Ispra (IT)	78.6	12.5	7.6	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0
Oct-11 (II)	Langen (DE)	59.4	39.9	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jun-12	Ispra (IT)	92.2	0.5	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sep-13	Langen (DE)	75.7	20.9	2.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
Sep-13	Ispra (IT)	89.4	7.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oct-13	Ispra (IT)	86.8	8.9	3.6	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
May-14	Ispra (IT)	81.8	15.2	1.1	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.1
Oct-15	Langen (DE)	73.2	23.9	0.7	1.4	0.0	0.7	0.0
Oct-15 (I)	Ispra (IT)	90.2	7.6	1.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0

Table 9: Flags summary

As in previous IEs, the adopted criteria for high concentrations were the standard deviations for proficiency assessment, deriving from the European Standards' uncertainty requirements.

The reproducibility standard deviation obtained at this (Annex C) and previous IEs [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [33], [34], [35], [36], [37], [38], [39], [40] and [41] is comparable to the mentioned criteria. On the other hand, the uncertainty criteria for zero levels were those set in AQUILA's position paper [12].

In the present IE a high share of '1' results can be observed confirming the good performance of the most recent IEs.

In this exercise 99.4% of the results in the z'-score evaluations were satisfactory, 2 results were found questionable (0.6%).

<i>IE</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>Satisfactory (%)</i>	<i>Questionable (%)</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory (%)</i>
June/05	Ispra (IT)	94.7	2.3	3.0
June/07	Ispra (IT)	97.8	1.9	0.3
October/07	Essen (DE)	93.2	4.6	2.2
April/08	Ispra (IT)	93.8	2.1	4.1
October/08_1	Ispra (IT)	92.9	4.2	2.9
October/08_2	Ispra (IT)	97.0	3.0	0.0
September/09	Langen (DE)	94.3	4.7	0.9
October/09	Ispra (IT)	98.2	1.8	0.0
June/10	Ispra (IT)	97.0	3.0	0.0
September/11	Ispra (IT)	99.4	0.3	0.3
October/11	Ispra (IT)	98.7	1.3	0.0
October/11	Langen (DE)	99.3	0.7	0.0
June/12	Ispra (IT)	100.0	0.0	0.0
September/13	Langen (DE)	98.6	1.4	0.0
September/13	Ispra (IT)	100.0	0.0	0.0
October/13	Ispra (IT)	99.3	0.7	0.0
May/14	Ispra (IT)	98.1	0.7	1.1
October/15	Langen (DE)	97.9	1.4	0.7
October/15_1	Ispra (IT)	99.4	0.6	0.0

Table 10: Z'-score summary

Comparability of results among AQUILA participants at the highest concentration level, excluding outliers, is acceptable for all pollutants measurements.

The relative reproducibility limits, at the highest studied concentration levels, are 6.5% for SO₂, 4.4% for CO, 4.9% for O₃, for NO 3.9% and for NO₂ 7.0% all within the objective derived from criteria imposed by the European Commission (σ_p see Table 4).

During this IE the performance of almost all NRL was generally satisfactory. Only one outlier was identified: At level 0 for CO (Table 53).

7. References

- [1] Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe, L 152, 11.06.2008
- [2] EN 14626:2012, Ambient air quality - Standard method for the measurement of the concentration of carbon monoxide by non-dispersive infrared spectroscopy
- [3] EN 14212:2012, Ambient air quality - Standard method for the measurement of the concentration of sulphur dioxide by ultraviolet fluorescence
- [4] EN 14211:2012, Ambient air quality - Standard method for the measurement of the concentration of nitrogen dioxide and nitrogen monoxide by chemiluminescence
- [5] EN 14625:2012, Ambient air quality - Standard method for the measurement of the concentration of ozone by ultraviolet photometry
- [6] ISO 6143:2001, Gas analysis - Comparison methods for determining and checking the composition of calibration gas mixtures
- [7] ISO 6144:2003, Gas analysis - Preparation of calibration gas mixtures - Static volumetric method
- [8] ISO 6145-7:2001, Gas analysis - Preparation of calibration gas mixtures using dynamic volumetric methods - Part 7: Thermal mass-flow controllers
- [9] Mücke H.-G., (2008), Air quality management in the WHO European Region – Results of a quality assurance and control programme on air quality monitoring (1994-2004), Environment International, EI-01718
- [10] Mücke H.-G., et al. (2000), European Intercomparison workshop on air quality monitoring vol.4 – Measuring NO, NO₂, O₃ and SO₂ – Air Hygiene Report 13, WHO Collaboration Centre for Air Quality Management and Air Pollution Control, ISSN 0938 - 9822
- [11] <http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/aquila-project/aquila-homepage.html>
- [12] AQUILA POSITION PAPER N. 37, (2008) Protocol for intercomparison exercise. Organisation of intercomparison exercises for gaseous air pollution for EU national air quality reference laboratories and laboratories of the WHO EURO region http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/uploads/fileadmin/H04/Air_Quality/N%2037%20final%20version%20IE%20organisation%20and%20evaluation.pdf
- [13] ISO 13528:2015, Statistical methods for use in proficiency testing by inter-laboratory comparisons
- [14] ISO 5725-1:1994, Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results – Part 1: General principles and definitions
- [15] ISO 5725-2:1994, Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results – Part 2: Basic method for the determination of repeatability and reproducibility of a standard measurement method
- [16] ISO 5725-6:1994, Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results - Part 6: Use in practice of accuracy values
- [17] Harmonisation of Directive 92/72/EEC on air pollution by ozone, E. De Saeger et al., EUR 17662, 1997
- [18] De Saeger E. et al., (1997) European comparison of Nitrogen Dioxide calibration methods. EUR 17661.

- [19] ISO 15337:2009, Ambient air - Gas phase titration - Calibration of analysers for ozone
- [20] Kapus M. et al. (2009) The evaluation of the Intercomparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ carried out in June 2007 in Ispra. JRC scientific and technical reports. EUR 23804.
- [21] Kapus M. et al. (2009) The evaluation of the Intercomparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ - April 2008. JRC scientific and technical reports. EUR 23805.
- [22] Kapus M. et al. (2009) The evaluation of the Intercomparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 6-9 October 2008. JRC scientific and technical reports. EUR 23806.
- [23] Kapus M. et al. (2009) The evaluation of the Intercomparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 13-16 October 2008. JRC scientific and technical reports. EUR 23807.
- [24] Belis C. A. et al. (2010) The evaluation of the Interlaboratory comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ Langen 20-25 September 2009. EUR 24376
- [25] Belis C. A. et al. (2010) The evaluation of the Interlaboratory comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 19-22 October 2009. EUR 24476
- [26] Viallon J. et al 2009 Metrologia 46 08017. Final report, on-going key comparison BIPM.QM-K1: Ozone at ambient level, comparison with JRC, 2008. doi: 10.1088/0026-1394/46/1A/08017
- [27] Viallon, J., et al. (2006), International comparison CCQM-P28: Ozone at ambient level, Metrologia, 43, Tech. Suppl., 08010, doi:10.1088/0026-1394/43/1A/08010
- [28] Tanimoto, H., et al. (2006), Intercomparison of ultraviolet photometry and gas-phase titration techniques for ozone reference standards at ambient levels, Journal of Geophysical Research, vol. 111, D16313, doi:10.1029/2005JD006983
- [29] GUM Workbench, The Tool for Expression of Uncertainty of Measurements
- [30] VDI 2449 Part3: 2001, Measurement methods test criteria- General method for the determination of the uncertainty of calibratable measurement methods.
- [31] Mücke H-G, et al. (1996). European Intercomparison Workshops on Air Quality Monitoring. Vol. 2 – Measuring of CO, NO, NO₂ and O₃ – Air Hygiene Report 9. Berlin, Germany: WHO Collaborating Centre for Air Quality Management and Air Pollution Control; ISSN 0938-9822.
- [32] ISO 17043:2010, Conformity assessment - General requirements for proficiency testing
- [33] Barbieri M. et al. (2011) The evaluation of the Interlaboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ Ispra 14-17 June 2010. EUR 24943.
- [34] Barbieri M. et al. (2012) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂, 11th-14th June 2012 Ispra. EUR 25536.
- [35] Barbieri M. et al. (2012) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂, Langen 23rd-28th October 2011. EUR 25387.

- [36] Barbieri M. et al. (2012) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂, 03rd-06th October 2011 Ispra. EUR 25386.
- [37] Barbieri M. et al. (2012) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂, 26th-29th September 2011 Ispra. EUR 25385.
- [38] Barbieri M., Lagler F., Mücke H.G., Wirtz K. and Stummer V. (2014) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for NO, NO₂, SO₂, CO, and O₃ Langen (D) 1st-6th September 2013. EUR 26578.
- [39] Barbieri M., Lagler F., (2014) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 30st September-3rd October 2013 Ispra. EUR 26604.
- [40] Barbieri M., Lagler F., (2014) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 7st-10th October 2013 Ispra. EUR 26639.
- [41] Barbieri M., Lagler F., (2014) Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ 19th-22nd May 2014 Ispra. EUR 27199.
- [42] COMMISSION DIRECTIVE (EU) 2015/1480 of 28 August 2015 (L226/4) amending several annexes to Directives 2004/107/EC and 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down the rules concerning reference methods, data validation and location of sampling points for the assessment of ambient air quality

Annex A. Assigned values

The assigned values of tested concentration levels (run) were derived from ERLAP's measurements which are calibrated against the certified reference values of CRMs and are traceable to international standards. In this perspective the assigned values are reference values as defined in the ISO 13528 [13].

To foster its reference function ERLAP is participating regularly to key comparisons of the Gas Analysis Working Group within the framework of BIPM's CCQM.

During this IE ERLAP's SO₂, CO and NO analysers were calibrated according to the methodology described in the ISO 6143 [6]. Reference gas mixtures were produced from the primary reference materials (produced and certified by NMi Van Swinden Laboratorium) by dynamic dilution method using mass flow controllers [8]. All flows were measured with a certified molbloc/molbox1 system. For O₃ measurements, the analyzers were calibrated using the JRC SRP42 primary standard (constructed by NIST) which has been compared to BIPM primary standard [26]. The photometer absorption cross section uncertainty (1.06%) was included in the uncertainty budget [27], [28].

The reference gas mixture and the calibration experiment evaluation were carried out using two computer applications, the "GUM WORKBENCH" [29] and "B-least" [30] respectively. For extending calibration from the NO to NO₂ channel of NO_x analyser the GPT test was performed to establish the efficiency of NO₂-converter.

ERLAP's measurement results were validated by comparison to the group statistics (\bar{x}^* and s^*) for every parameter and concentration level of the IE. These statistics are calculated from participants, applying the robust method described in the Annex C of the ISO 13528 [13]. The validation is taking into account ERLAP's measurement result (X) and its standard uncertainty (u_X) as given in Equation 4 [13]:

$$\frac{|\bar{x}^* - X|}{\sqrt{\frac{(1,25 \cdot s^*)^2}{p} + u_X^2}} < 2 \quad \text{Equation 4}$$

Where ' \bar{x}^* ' and ' s^* ' represent robust average and robust standard deviation respectively and ' p ' is the number of participants.

Table 111 all inputs for Equation 4 are given and all ERLAP's measurement results are confirmed to be valid.

As a group evaluation robust average (\bar{x}^*) and robust standard deviation (s^*) were calculated (applying the procedure described in Annex C of ISO 13528) for each run, and are presented in the following tables.

run	unit	X	uX'	x*	s*	p	val.
NO_0	nmol/mol	-0.20	0.71	0.07	0.26	10	OK
NO_1	nmol/mol	621.36	2.97	618.96	8.55	10	OK
NO_2	nmol/mol	466.85	2.30	465.87	5.45	10	OK
NO_3	nmol/mol	217.03	1.26	215.72	2.59	10	OK
NO_4	nmol/mol	101.11	0.88	101.59	2.46	10	OK
NO_5	nmol/mol	80.69	0.82	80.11	1.40	10	OK
NO_6	nmol/mol	19.18	0.72	19.43	0.76	10	OK
NO_7	nmol/mol	405.28	2.02	403.34	3.85	10	OK
NO_8	nmol/mol	311.55	1.64	311.63	4.06	10	OK
NO_9	nmol/mol	50.26	0.76	49.97	0.80	10	OK
NO_10	nmol/mol	29.85	0.73	29.75	0.73	10	OK
NO2_0	nmol/mol	-0.03	0.72	0.03	0.23	10	OK
NO2_1	nmol/mol	2.90	2.34	3.76	1.18	8	OK
NO2_2	nmol/mol	157.72	2.40	155.60	3.16	10	OK
NO2_3	nmol/mol	0.84	1.10	1.17	0.38	8	OK
NO2_4	nmol/mol	116.09	1.19	114.34	2.18	10	OK
NO2_5	nmol/mol	0.26	0.80	0.38	0.34	8	OK
NO2_6	nmol/mol	61.94	0.83	61.00	1.17	9	OK
NO2_7	nmol/mol	1.62	1.63	1.82	0.52	7	OK
NO2_8	nmol/mol	95.25	1.68	94.48	1.09	9	OK
NO2_9	nmol/mol	0.15	0.75	0.24	0.28	7	OK
NO2_10	nmol/mol	20.60	0.75	20.31	0.51	9	OK
CO_0	μmol/mol	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	10	OK
CO_1	μmol/mol	8.55	0.04	8.46	0.13	10	OK
CO_2	μmol/mol	3.56	0.02	3.51	0.08	10	OK
CO_3	μmol/mol	1.04	0.01	1.02	0.03	10	OK
CO_4	μmol/mol	5.07	0.03	5.01	0.08	10	OK
CO_5	μmol/mol	2.04	0.01	2.01	0.04	10	OK
O3_0	nmol/mol	0.00	0.22	-0.13	0.14	10	OK
O3_1	nmol/mol	152.23	1.10	152.76	0.97	10	OK
O3_2	nmol/mol	123.45	0.89	124.04	1.23	10	OK
O3_3	nmol/mol	55.59	0.41	55.86	0.62	10	OK
O3_4	nmol/mol	91.58	0.66	92.20	1.05	10	OK
O3_5	nmol/mol	17.08	0.22	17.23	0.23	10	OK
SO2_0	nmol/mol	0.02	0.50	0.04	0.28	10	OK
SO2_1	nmol/mol	134.44	0.89	133.45	2.38	10	OK
SO2_2	nmol/mol	72.63	0.65	72.25	1.07	10	OK
SO2_3	nmol/mol	5.25	0.51	5.22	0.26	10	OK
SO2_4	nmol/mol	31.26	0.54	31.13	0.31	10	OK
SO2_5	nmol/mol	10.38	0.51	10.31	0.21	10	OK

Table 11: Validation of assigned values (X)

By comparison to the robust averages (x^*) with taking into account the standard uncertainties of assigned values (uX'), and robust standard deviations (s^*) as denoted by Equation 4.

The homogeneity of test gas was evaluated from measurements at the beginning and end of the distribution line. From the relative differences between beginning and end measurements, average and standard deviation were calculated, and the uncertainty

of test gas due to lack of homogeneity was calculated as the sum of squares of these average and standard deviation.

$$u_{X'}^2 = u_X^2 + (X \cdot u_{\text{homogeneity}})^2 \quad \text{Equation 5}$$

The upper and lower limits of bias due to homogeneity were evaluated to be smaller than 0.5% which constitutes the relative standard uncertainty of 0.3% of each concentration level. The standard uncertainties of assigned/reference values ($u_{X'}$) were calculated with Equation 5 and used in the proficiency evaluations of chapter 3.

Annex B. The results of the IE

In this annex are reported participant's results, presented both in tables and graphs. For all mixture concentration generated (run), participants were asked to report 3 results representing 30 minutes measurement each (x_{ij}).

In this annex are presented the reported data and their uncertainty $u(x_i)$ and $U(x_i)$ expressed in mol/mol units.

For all the runs except concentration levels 0, also average (\bar{x}_i) and standard deviation (s_i) of each participant are presented.

The assigned value is indicated on the graphs with the red line and the individual laboratories expanded uncertainties ($U(x_i)$) are indicated with error bars.

Reported values for SO₂

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
x_i 1	-0.52	0.04	-0.37	0.03	0.96	0.64	0.02	0.21	-0.11	0.07
$u(x_i)$	0.5	0.21	1.25	0.2	0.75	0.3	0.5	0.29	0.64	0.51
$U(x_i)$	1	0.42	2.5	0.4	1.5	0.6	1	0.57	1.27	1.01

Table 12: Reported values for SO₂ run 0.




Figure 13: Reported values for SO₂ run 0.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	128.31	134.58	135.76	132.79	137.93	131.05	134.07	131.81	132.51	132.69
\bar{x}_i 2	128.53	134.9	136.33	133.02	138.4	131.37	134.55	132.08	133.05	133.36
\bar{x}_i 3	128.8	135.08	136.52	133.16	138.78	131.61	134.71	132.21	133.31	133.77
\bar{x}_i	128.54	134.85	136.2	132.99	138.37	131.34	134.44	132.03	132.95	133.27
s_i	0.24	0.25	0.39	0.18	0.42	0.28	0.33	0.2	0.4	0.54
$u(x_i)$	2	2.36	1.44	3.8	3.5	3.18	0.8	1.26	2.36	2.7
$U(x_i)$	3.9	4.73	2.89	7.6	7	6.36	1.59	2.53	4.73	5.41

Table 13: Reported values for SO₂ run 1.




Figure 14: Reported values for SO₂ run 1.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	69.34	73.12	73.46	72.04	75	71.35	72.6	71.93	71.97	71.89
\bar{x}_i 2	69.3	73.17	73.51	72.02	75.06	71.28	72.63	71.86	71.96	71.99
\bar{x}_i 3	69.35	73.22	73.44	72.01	75.17	71.17	72.67	71.83	72.02	71.95
\bar{x}_i	69.33	73.17	73.47	72.02	75.07	71.26	72.63	71.87	71.98	71.94
s_i	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05
$u(x_i)$	1.7	1.46	1.25	2.05	2.2	1.71	0.61	0.73	1.39	1.69
$U(x_i)$	3.5	2.92	2.5	4.1	4.4	3.42	1.23	1.46	2.77	3.38

Table 14: Reported values for SO₂ run 2.




Figure 15: Reported values for SO₂ run 2.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	4.45	5.27	4.99	5.25	6.32	5.67	5.26	5.43	5.12	5.1
\bar{x}_i 2	4.49	5.28	4.86	5.21	6.28	5.72	5.25	5.26	5.09	5.03
\bar{x}_i 3	4.49	5.22	4.94	5.21	6.3	5.66	5.23	5.34	5.12	5.05
\bar{x}_i	4.47	5.25	4.93	5.22	6.3	5.68	5.24	5.34	5.11	5.06
s_i	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.03
$u(x_i)$	1.5	0.42	1.25	0.2	0.9	0.34	0.5	0.29	0.64	0.59
$U(x_i)$	3	0.85	2.5	0.4	1.8	0.68	1.01	0.58	1.28	1.18

Table 15: Reported values for SO₂ run 3.




Figure 16: Reported values for SO₂ run 3.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	29.63	31.49	31.29	31.04	32.84	30.94	31.2	31.02	30.96	30.84
\bar{x}_i 2	29.77	31.54	31.31	31.13	32.84	30.97	31.27	31.09	31.04	30.93
\bar{x}_i 3	29.74	31.52	31.62	31.19	32.9	30.89	31.3	30.99	31.04	30.89
\bar{x}_i	29.71	31.51	31.4	31.12	32.86	30.93	31.25	31.03	31.01	30.88
s_i	0.07	0.02	0.18	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
$u(x_i)$	1.6	0.82	1.25	0.89	1.4	0.9	0.53	0.41	0.83	1.01
$U(x_i)$	3.2	1.64	2.5	1.78	2.8	1.8	1.06	0.82	1.66	2.03

Table 16: Reported values for SO₂ run 4.




Figure 17: Reported values for SO₂ run 4.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
x_i 1	9.42	10.42	10.19	10.37	11.53	10.65	10.39	10.21	10.24	10.12
x_i 2	9.47	10.4	10.19	10.35	11.54	10.62	10.37	10.16	10.25	10.06
x_i 3	9.51	10.45	10.27	10.36	11.57	10.57	10.37	10.18	10.23	10.15
\bar{x}_i	9.46	10.42	10.21	10.36	11.54	10.61	10.37	10.18	10.24	10.11
s_i	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.04
$u(x_i)$	1.5	0.52	1.25	0.3	0.95	0.44	0.51	0.3	0.66	0.67
$U(x_i)$	3.1	1.04	2.5	0.6	1.9	0.88	1.01	0.6	1.32	1.34

Table 17: Reported values for SO₂ run 5.




Figure 18: Reported values for SO₂ run 5.

Reported values for CO

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	-0.225	0.01	0	0.021	-0.024	0.001	0.006	0.016	-0.062	0.01
$u(x_i)$	0.13	0.024	0.1	0.1	0.09	0.048	0.008	0.09	0.069	0.08
$U(x_i)$	0.26	0.048	0.2	0.2	0.18	0.095	0.017	0.176	0.139	0.16

Table 18: Reported values for CO run 0.




Figure 19: Reported values for CO run 0.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	8.313	8.466	8.268	8.565	8.382	8.496	8.548	8.669	8.404	8.456
\bar{x}_i 2	8.329	8.471	8.332	8.573	8.387	8.496	8.554	8.68	8.394	8.468
\bar{x}_i 3	8.342	8.478	8.316	8.577	8.393	8.494	8.562	8.687	8.404	8.477
\bar{x}_i	8.328	8.472	8.305	8.572	8.387	8.495	8.555	8.679	8.401	8.467
s_i	0.015	0.006	0.033	0.006	0.006	0.001	0.007	0.009	0.006	0.011
$u(x_i)$	0.21	0.168	0.1	0.36	0.19	0.133	0.034	0.12	0.163	0.177
$U(x_i)$	0.41	0.337	0.2	0.72	0.38	0.265	0.067	0.237	0.326	0.355

Table 19: Reported values for CO run 1.




Figure 20: Reported values for CO run 1.

values	laboratories									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_1	3.318	3.526	3.173	3.603	3.469	3.528	3.556	3.577	3.449	3.525
\bar{x}_2	3.322	3.526	3.173	3.604	3.47	3.528	3.556	3.58	3.449	3.53
\bar{x}_3	3.32	3.529	3.14	3.602	3.476	3.528	3.557	3.577	3.449	3.53
\bar{x}_i	3.32	3.527	3.162	3.603	3.472	3.528	3.556	3.578	3.449	3.528
s_i	0.002	0.002	0.019	0.001	0.004	0	0.001	0.002	0	0.003
$u(x_i)$	0.16	0.091	0.1	0.151	0.13	0.07	0.016	0.09	0.092	0.105
$U(x_i)$	0.32	0.182	0.2	0.302	0.26	0.14	0.032	0.188	0.184	0.21

Table 20: Reported values for CO run 2.




Figure 21: Reported values for CO run 2.

values	laboratories									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_1	0.851	1.03	0.961	1.057	0.985	1.041	1.037	1.032	0.967	1.03
\bar{x}_2	0.856	1.03	0.961	1.056	0.985	1.038	1.037	1.035	0.967	1.028
\bar{x}_3	0.871	1.03	0.961	1.056	0.985	1.036	1.039	1.028	0.967	1.03
\bar{x}_i	0.859	1.03	0.961	1.056	0.985	1.038	1.038	1.032	0.967	1.029
s_i	0.01	0	0	0.001	0	0.003	0.001	0.004	0	0.001
$u(x_i)$	0.14	0.062	0.1	0.1	0.105	0.05	0.009	0.09	0.071	0.068
$U(x_i)$	0.28	0.124	0.2	0.2	0.21	0.1	0.018	0.178	0.143	0.136

Table 21: Reported values for CO run 3.




Figure 22: Reported values for CO run 3.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	4.881	5.013	4.711	5.078	4.968	5.021	5.064	5.134	4.991	5.04
\bar{x}_i 2	4.877	5.011	4.711	5.079	4.971	5.023	5.066	5.132	4.991	5.044
\bar{x}_i 3	4.9	5.01	4.711	5.08	4.97	5.021	5.067	5.131	4.991	5.045
\bar{x}_i	4.886	5.011	4.711	5.079	4.97	5.022	5.066	5.132	4.991	5.043
s_i	0.012	0.002	0	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.002	0	0.003
$u(x_i)$	0.18	0.115	0.1	0.213	0.15	0.087	0.021	0.1	0.112	0.127
$U(x_i)$	0.35	0.23	0.2	0.426	0.3	0.175	0.042	0.199	0.223	0.254

Table 22: Reported values for CO run 4.




Figure 23: Reported values for CO run 4.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	1.893	2.023	1.811	2.07	1.987	2.024	2.043	2.021	1.958	2.035
\bar{x}_i 2	1.903	2.023	1.811	2.067	1.986	2.029	2.044	2.022	1.948	2.035
\bar{x}_i 3	1.905	2.018	1.811	2.066	1.986	2.027	2.042	2.031	1.958	2.033
\bar{x}_i	1.9	2.021	1.811	2.068	1.986	2.027	2.043	2.025	1.955	2.034
s_i	0.006	0.003	0	0.002	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.006	0.006	0.001
$u(x_i)$	0.15	0.067	0.1	0.1	0.12	0.056	0.011	0.09	0.077	0.083
$U(x_i)$	0.3	0.133	0.2	0.2	0.24	0.112	0.023	0.18	0.155	0.166

Table 23: Reported values for CO run 5.




Figure 24: Reported values for CO run 5.

Reported values for O₃

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i	-0.31	-0.16	-0.04	-0.19	-0.16	0	0	-0.24	-0.22	0.23
$u(x_i)$	0.3	0.44	0.9	0.5	1.25	0.55	0.22	0.15	0.63	1
$U(x_i)$	0.6	0.88	1.8	1	2.5	1.1	0.44	0.3	1.26	2

Table 24: Reported values for O₃ run 0.




Figure 25: Reported values for O₃ run 0.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i	152.14	152.43	153	149.14	156.52	153.74	151.87	152.1		150.18
\bar{x}_i	152.58	153.28	153.33	149.51	157.7	154.25	152.34	152.64	152.94	149.81
\bar{x}_i	152.78	153.63	153.61	150.24	157.84	154.35	152.49	152.84	152.94	150.25
\bar{x}_i	152.5	153.11	153.31	149.63	157.35	154.11	152.23	152.52	152.94	150.08
s_i	0.32	0.61	0.3	0.56	0.72	0.32	0.32	0.38	0	0.23
$u(x_i)$	1.6	1.96	2.38	3.16	2.4	3.02	1.01	2.23	3.56	2.13
$U(x_i)$	3.1	3.91	4.75	6.32	4.8	6.04	2.01	4.47	7.11	4.25

Table 25: Reported values for O₃ run 1




Figure 26: Reported values for O₃ run 1.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	123.29	124.43	123.87	122.18	127.63	125.17	123.24	123.68		122.12
\bar{x}_i 2	123.58	124.83	124.05	122.63	127.5	125.48	123.52	123.9	124.69	122.61
\bar{x}_i 3	123.71	124.97	124.2	122.83	127.35	125.55	123.59	123.98	124.69	122.76
\bar{x}_i	123.52	124.74	124.04	122.54	127.49	125.4	123.45	123.85	124.69	122.49
s_i	0.21	0.28	0.16	0.33	0.14	0.2	0.18	0.15	0	0.33
$u(x_i)$	1.3	1.7	1.92	2.58	2	2.47	0.81	1.81	2.92	1.92
$U(x_i)$	2.6	3.4	3.85	5.16	4	4.93	1.61	3.63	5.84	3.84

Table 26: Reported values for O₃ run 2.




Figure 27: Reported values for O₃ run 2.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	55.52	56.24	55.89	54.92	57.3	56.43	55.5	55.69		55.22
\bar{x}_i 2	55.64	56.44	55.97	54.93	57.3	56.56	55.61	55.77	55.82	55.26
\bar{x}_i 3	55.69	56.67	56.06	54.96	57.29	56.56	55.65	55.82	55.82	55.29
\bar{x}_i	55.61	56.45	55.97	54.93	57.29	56.51	55.58	55.76	55.82	55.25
s_i	0.08	0.21	0.08	0.02	0	0.07	0.07	0.06	0	0.03
$u(x_i)$	0.8	1.14	0.9	1.15	1.5	1.44	0.38	0.82	1.42	1.41
$U(x_i)$	1.5	2.28	1.8	2.3	3	2.88	0.75	1.64	2.85	2.83

Table 27: Reported values for O₃ run 3.




Figure 28: Reported values for O₃ run 3.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	91.7	92.71	92.31	90.13	94.24	92.98	91.43	91.72	92.11	90.96
\bar{x}_i 2	91.92	93	92.46	90.28	94.24	93.23	91.65	92.05	92.68	91.28
\bar{x}_i 3	91.96	93.11	92.55	89.96	94.03	93.26	91.67	92.04	92.74	91.45
\bar{x}_i	91.86	92.94	92.44	90.12	94.17	93.15	91.58	91.93	92.51	91.23
s_i	0.14	0.2	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.15	0.13	0.18	0.34	0.24
$u(x_i)$	1.1	1.46	1.43	1.89	1.65	1.9	0.59	1.35	2.21	1.68
$U(x_i)$	2.1	2.91	2.87	3.78	3.3	3.81	1.19	2.7	4.42	3.37

Table 28: Reported values for O₃ run 4.




Figure 29: Reported values for O₃ run 4.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	17.06	17.69	17.32	17	17.43	17.33	17.05	17.09	16.87	17.19
\bar{x}_i 2	17.1	17.62	17.38	17.06	17.5	17.39	17.1	17.11	16.99	17.35
\bar{x}_i 3	17.14	17.61	17.34	17	17.52	17.4	17.1	17.16	17.04	17.34
\bar{x}_i	17.1	17.64	17.34	17.02	17.48	17.37	17.08	17.12	16.96	17.29
s_i	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.09
$u(x_i)$	0.5	0.81	0.9	0.5	1.35	1.36	0.21	0.26	0.74	1.13
$U(x_i)$	0.9	1.61	1.8	1	2.7	2.72	0.43	0.52	1.48	2.26

Table 29: Reported values for O₃ run 5.




Figure 30: Reported values for O₃ run 5.

Reported values for NO

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i	0.06	-0.03	0.04	0.04	-0.51	0.41	-0.2	0.02	0.41	0.28
$u(x_i)$	0.8	0.32	1.25	0.5	0.7	0.67	0.71	0.29	0.68	0.5
$U(x_i)$	1.6	0.64	2.5	1	1.4	1.34	1.42	0.57	1.35	1

Table 30: Reported values for NO run 0.




Figure 31: Reported values for NO run 0.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i	617.03	631.93	610.89	625.34	608.69	616.47	620.82	611.17	629.75	612.69
\bar{x}_i	618.74	632.2	612.5	626.12	609.64	617.24	621.43	612.38	630.16	613.14
\bar{x}_i	619.57	632.27	613.47	625.99	609.59	617.69	621.83	613.66		613.42
\bar{x}_i	618.44	632.13	612.28	625.81	609.3	617.13	621.36	612.4	629.95	613.08
s_i	1.29	0.18	1.3	0.41	0.53	0.61	0.5	1.24	0.29	0.36
$u(x_i)$	9.1	9.04	9.8	14.4	9.6	9.49	2.32	5.65	16.31	14.78
$U(x_i)$	18.3	18.08	19.59	28.8	19.2	18.98	4.63	11.31	32.62	29.56

Table 31: Reported values for NO run 1.




Figure 32: Reported values for NO run 1.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_1	465.5	475.79	461.98	458.56	458.68	465.53	467.43	465.44		461.82
\bar{x}_2	464.54	475.24	462	474.42	458.58	464.66	466.81	466.12	477.58	461.18
\bar{x}_3	463.38	474.8	462.16	474.06	458.08	464.15	466.31	465.77	477.24	460.72
\bar{x}_i	464.47	475.27	462.04	469.01	458.44	464.78	466.85	465.77	477.41	461.24
s_i	1.06	0.49	0.09	9.05	0.32	0.69	0.56	0.34	0.24	0.55
$u(x_i)$	7.1	7.03	7.39	10.9	7.4	7.06	1.83	4.31	12.37	11.29
$U(x_i)$	14.1	14.06	14.79	21.81	14.8	14.12	3.65	8.61	24.74	22.58

Table 32: Reported values for NO run 2.




Figure 33: Reported values for NO run 2.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_1	212.58	219.45	215.05	215.37	211.88	215.27	217.01	217.07		213.46
\bar{x}_2	213.22	219.75	214.92	216.83	212.11	215.39	217.22	217.15	217.74	213.68
\bar{x}_3	213.54	219.79	213.91	217.62	211.98	215.24	216.85	217.19	217.92	213.76
\bar{x}_i	213.11	219.66	214.62	216.6	211.99	215.3	217.02	217.13	217.83	213.63
s_i	0.48	0.18	0.62	1.14	0.11	0.07	0.18	0.06	0.12	0.15
$u(x_i)$	3.7	3.48	3.43	5.01	3.8	3.17	1.07	2.02	5.68	5.59
$U(x_i)$	7.3	6.95	6.87	10.02	7.6	6.34	2.15	4.05	11.35	11.19

Table 33: Reported values for NO run 3.




Figure 34: Reported values for NO run 3.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	99.63	102.95	100.05	104.32	99.17	101.39	101.33	104.2		100.03
\bar{x}_i 2	99.31	102.63	99.7	103.87	98.75	101.05	101.04	103.82	105.69	99.94
\bar{x}_i 3	99.17	102.68	99.59	103.94	98.8	101.02	100.97	103.75	105.02	99.85
\bar{x}_i	99.37	102.75	99.78	104.04	98.9	101.15	101.11	103.92	105.35	99.94
s_i	0.23	0.17	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.2	0.19	0.24	0.47	0.09
$u(x_i)$	2.1	1.85	1.6	2.39	2.2	1.65	0.83	1	2.81	2.98
$U(x_i)$	4.2	3.71	3.19	4.78	4.4	3.3	1.66	2	5.62	5.96

Table 34: Reported values for NO run 4.




Figure 35: Reported values for NO run 4.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	78.11	81.32	78.95	79.69	78.01	79.78	80.43	81.31		79.16
\bar{x}_i 2	78.52	81.76	79.37	80.02	78.57	80.23	80.77	82.6	80.89	79.57
\bar{x}_i 3	78.78	81.84	79.48	80.52	78.56	80.34	80.87	82.76	81.02	79.7
\bar{x}_i	78.47	81.64	79.26	80.07	78.38	80.11	80.69	82.22	80.95	79.47
s_i	0.33	0.28	0.28	0.41	0.32	0.29	0.23	0.79	0.09	0.28
$u(x_i)$	1.8	1.56	1.27	1.85	1.9	1.45	0.78	0.82	2.2	2.51
$U(x_i)$	3.7	3.11	2.54	3.7	3.8	2.9	1.56	1.63	4.4	5.01

Table 35: Reported values for NO run 5.




Figure 36: Reported values for NO run 5.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_1	18.77	19.66	19.08	20.62	18.35	19.5	19.21	20.63		19
\bar{x}_2	18.84	19.52	19.1	20.81	18.28	19.51	19.22	20.59	21.26	19.13
\bar{x}_3	18.72	19.52	19	20.63	18.22	19.41	19.11	20.52	21.21	18.95
\bar{x}_i	18.77	19.56	19.06	20.68	18.28	19.47	19.18	20.58	21.23	19.02
s_i	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.1	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.09
$u(x_i)$	1	0.73	1.25	0.5	1	1.29	0.72	0.34	0.87	1.12
$U(x_i)$	2.1	1.45	2.5	1	2	2.57	1.44	0.69	1.74	2.23

Table 36: Reported values for NO run 6.




Figure 37: Reported values for NO run 6.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_1	401.51	410.34	402.35	406.15	396.07	401.24	404.82	402.03		398.45
\bar{x}_2	403.02	410.83	403.28	407.59	396.92	401.91	405.39	402.97	405.54	399.16
\bar{x}_3	403.59	411.07	403.79	407.24	397.34	402.3	405.62	403.33	405.65	399.47
\bar{x}_i	402.7	410.74	403.14	406.99	396.77	401.81	405.27	402.77	405.59	399.02
s_i	1.07	0.37	0.73	0.75	0.64	0.53	0.41	0.67	0.07	0.52
$u(x_i)$	6.2	6.17	6.45	9.37	6.5	6.06	1.62	3.73	10.51	10.08
$U(x_i)$	12.4	12.33	12.9	18.74	13	12.12	3.23	7.45	21.03	20.16

Table 37: Reported values for NO run 7.




Figure 38: Reported values for NO run 7.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
xi 1	310.43	316.33	310.83	316.88	305.72	310.19	311.85	312.61		307.75
xi 2	310.38	316.19	310.39	316.52	305.48	310.08	311.46	312.49	314.98	307.65
xi 3	310.4	316.18	310.35	315.65	305.68	309.74	311.33	312.2	315.88	307.5
xi	310.4	316.23	310.52	316.35	305.62	310	311.54	312.43	315.43	307.63
si	0.02	0.08	0.26	0.63	0.12	0.23	0.27	0.21	0.63	0.12
u(xi)	5	4.83	4.97	7.26	5.2	4.62	1.34	2.9	8.19	7.98
U(xi)	9.9	9.67	9.94	14.52	10.4	9.23	2.69	5.79	16.38	15.95

Table 38: Reported values for NO run 8.




Figure 39: Reported values for NO run 8.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
xi 1	48.99	51.02	50	49.27	48.58	49.96	50.23	51.57	50.34	49.6
xi 2	49.02	50.8	50.05	49.73	48.53	49.93	50.27	51.55	50.31	49.46
xi 3	49.22	50.88	50.1	49.42	48.56	49.91	50.27	51.57	50.55	49.66
xi	49.07	50.9	50.05	49.47	48.55	49.93	50.25	51.56	50.4	49.57
si	0.12	0.11	0.05	0.23	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.13	0.1
u(xi)	1.4	1.17	1.25	1.14	1.5	1.29	0.74	0.56	1.47	1.82
U(xi)	2.9	2.35	2.5	2.28	3	2.58	1.48	1.11	2.94	3.64

Table 39: Reported values for NO run 9.




Figure 40: Reported values for NO run 9.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	29.13	30.22	29.61	28.34	28.81	29.83	29.87	30.94	30.77	29.43
\bar{x}_i 2	29.13	30.18	29.61	29.5	28.84	29.81	29.87	30.93	30.47	29.54
\bar{x}_i 3	29.17	30.26	29.58	29.99	28.53	29.84	29.82	30.91	30.55	29.39
\bar{x}_i	29.14	30.22	29.6	29.27	28.72	29.82	29.85	30.92	30.59	29.45
s_i	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.84	0.17	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.15	0.07
$u(x_i)$	1.2	0.87	1.25	0.69	1.2	1.27	0.72	0.4	1.04	1.36
$U(x_i)$	2.3	1.74	2.5	1.38	2.4	2.53	1.45	0.81	2.08	2.71

Table 40: Reported values for NO run 10.




Figure 41: Reported values for NO run 10.

Reported values for NO₂

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	0.54	-0.19	0.08	-0.09	-0.58	0.19	-0.03	-0.04	0.36	0.04
$u(x_i)$	0.8	0.48	1.25	0.5	1.75	0.74	0.71	0.29	0.68	0.71
$U(x_i)$	1.6	0.96	2.5	1	3.5	1.47	1.43	0.57	1.35	1.42

Table 41: Reported values for NO₂ run 0.




Figure 42: Reported values for NO₂ run 0.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	157.04	159.41	156.03	149.33	153.24	156.12	157.37	155.78		148.79
\bar{x}_i 2	157.59	160.35	156.78	156.23	153.92	156.9	157.55	154.68	156.24	149.55
\bar{x}_i 3	158.91	160.87	157.23	155.48	154.48	157.43	158.25	156.43	156.84	149.88
\bar{x}_i	157.84	160.21	156.68	153.68	153.88	156.81	157.72	155.63	156.54	149.4
s_i	0.96	0.74	0.6	3.78	0.62	0.65	0.46	0.88	0.42	0.55
$u(x_i)$	2.9	2.88	2.51	3.58	4.5	4.86	2.36	4.27	4.11	3.94
$U(x_i)$	5.8	5.76	5.01	7.16	9	9.71	4.71	5.48	8.21	7.88

Table 42: Reported values for NO₂ run 2.




Figure 43: Reported values for NO₂ run 2.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	114.54	117.27	113.92	113.43	112.88	115.08	115.89	115.69		111.95
\bar{x}_i 2	114.75	117.53	114.08	113.9	113.02	115.27	116.03	115.9	114.82	112.3
\bar{x}_i 3	114.9	117.57	114.02	113.79	113.04	115.27	116.34	115.99	115.37	112.26
\bar{x}_i	114.73	117.45	114	113.7	112.98	115.2	116.08	115.86	115.09	112.17
s_i	0.18	0.16	0.08	0.24	0.08	0.11	0.23	0.15	0.38	0.19
$u(x_i)$	2.3	2.34	1.82	2.62	3.75	2.22	1.13	3.18	3.05	3.16
$U(x_i)$	4.7	4.68	3.65	5.24	7.5	4.45	2.27	6.36	6.11	6.32

Table 43: Reported values for NO₂ run 4.




Figure 44: Reported values for NO₂ run 4.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	60.47	62.3	60.56	59.59	59.91	61.4	61.88	62.3		60.09
\bar{x}_i 2	60.51	62.29	60.55	59.77	59.85	61.43	61.88	62.28	61.62	60.09
\bar{x}_i 3	60.5	62.38	60.64	60	60.11	61.5	62.06	62.47	61.94	60.11
\bar{x}_i	60.49	62.32	60.58	59.78	59.95	61.44	61.94	62.35	61.78	60.09
s_i	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.2	0.13	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.22	0.01
$u(x_i)$	1.6	1.55	1.25	1.38	2.8	0.88	0.81	1.73	1.74	2.13
$U(x_i)$	3.2	3.1	2.5	2.76	5.6	1.76	1.61	3.45	3.47	4.27

Table 44: Reported values for NO₂ run 6.




Figure 45: Reported values for NO₂ run 6.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	94.83	96.75	94.53	93.23	93.44	94.97	95.12	94.3		90.13
\bar{x}_i 2	94.97	96.77	94.66	93.7	93.32	94.87	95.39	94.36	93.33	90.19
\bar{x}_i 3	94.91	97.04	94.59	93.94	93.42	95.17	95.25	94.46	93.1	90.25
\bar{x}_i	94.9	96.85	94.59	93.62	93.39	95	95.25	94.37	93.21	90.19
s_i	0.07	0.16	0.06	0.36	0.06	0.15	0.13	0.08	0.16	0.06
$u(x_i)$	2.1	2.07	1.51	2.16	3.4	3.05	1.66	2.59	2.49	2.79
$U(x_i)$	4.1	4.13	3.03	4.32	6.8	6.1	3.31	5.5	4.98	5.57

Table 45: Reported values for NO₂ run 8.




Figure 46: Reported values for NO₂ run 8.

	laboratories									
values	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L
\bar{x}_i 1	20.39	20.72	20.37	18.23	19.53	20.7	20.58	20.77	21.39	20.04
\bar{x}_i 2	20.41	20.69	20.38	18.97	19.63	20.77	20.61	20.76	21.68	19.87
\bar{x}_i 3	20.39	20.7	20.38	19.73	19.91	20.74	20.6	20.74	21.43	19.83
\bar{x}_i	20.39	20.7	20.37	18.97	19.69	20.73	20.59	20.75	21.5	19.91
s_i	0.01	0.01	0	0.75	0.19	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.11
$u(x_i)$	1.1	0.93	1.25	0.5	2.1	0.6	0.75	0.64	0.88	1.18
$U(x_i)$	2.1	1.86	2.5	1	4.2	1.21	1.5	1.27	1.75	2.36

Table 46: Reported values for NO₂ run 10.




Figure 47: Reported values for NO₂ run 10.

Annex C. The precision of standardized measurement methods

For the main purpose of monitoring trends between different IEs undertaken by ERLAP the precision of standardized SO₂, CO, O₃ and NO_x measurement methods [2], [3], [4] and [5] as implemented by NRLs was evaluated.

Applied methodology is described in ISO 5725-1, 5725-2 and 5725-6 [14], [15] and [16]. The precision experiment has involved a total of ten laboratories, the actual number of labs (p_j) is reported in **Error! Reference source not found.**7. Six concentration levels (for run 0 only one value is requested so repeatability cannot be evaluated) were tested for O₃, CO, SO₂ and NO₂, and eleven for NO. Outlier tests were performed and results are reported in Annex D.

The repeatability standard deviation (s_r) was calculated in accordance with ISO 5725-6 as the square root of average within-laboratory variance. The repeatability limit (r) is calculated using Equation 6 [16]. It represents the biggest difference between two test results found on an identical test gas by one laboratory using the same apparatus within the shortest feasible time interval, that should not be exceeded on average more than once in 20 cases in the normal and correct operation of method.

$$r = t_{95\%,v} \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot s_r \quad \text{Equation 6}$$

The reproducibility standard deviation (s_R) was calculated in accordance with ISO 5725-6 as the square root of sum of repeatability and between-laboratory variance. The reproducibility limit (R) is calculated using Equation 7 [16]. It represents the biggest difference between two measurements on an identical test gas reported by two laboratories, which should not occur on average more than once in 20 cases in the normal and correct operation of method.

$$R = t_{95\%,v} \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot s_R \quad \text{Equation 7}$$

The repeatability standard deviation was evaluated with ($p_j \cdot (3-1)$) degrees of freedom (v) and reproducibility standard deviation with (p_j-1) degrees of freedom. The corresponding critical range student factors ($t_{\alpha,v}$) are reported in **Error! Reference source not found.**

parameter	run	P_j	t critical value 95% for r	t critical value 95% for R
CO	1,2,3,4,5	10	2.086	2.262
NO	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	10	2.086	2.262
NO ₂	2,4,6,8,10	10	2.086	2.262
O ₃	1,2,3,4,5	10	2.086	2.262
SO ₂	1,2,3,4,5	10	2.086	2.262

Table 47: Critical values of t used in the repeatability (r) and reproducibility (R) evaluation.

The repeatability (r) and reproducibility (R) limits of measurement methods are presented from Table 488 to Table 52 and from Figure 48 to Figure 52. Also reported is the 'reproducibility from common criteria (R (from σ_p))' calculated by substituting s_R in Equation 7 with a 'standard deviation for proficiency assessment' (see Table 4). Comparison between R and R (from σ_p) serves to indicate that σ_p is realistic ([13] 6.3.1) or from the other point of view, that the general methodology implemented by NRLs is appropriate for σ_p .

SO ₂ data (nmol/mol) without outliers			
group average	repeatability limit : r	reproducibility limit : R	reproducibility limit (relative)
0.1		1.4	
5.3	0.1	1.5	
10.4	0.1	1.7	
31.2	0.2	2.5	
72.3	0.2	4.8	
133.5	1.0	8.7	6.5%

Table 48: The R and r of SO₂ standard measurement method.




Figure 48: The R and r of SO₂ standard measurement method as a function of concentration.

CO data ($\mu\text{mol/mol}$) without outliers			
group average	repeatability limit: r	reproducibility limit: R	reproducibility limit (relative)
-0.002		0.084	4.4%
1.000	0.011	0.19	
1.987	0.011	0.252	
3.472	0.019	0.433	
4.991	0.013	0.381	
8.466	0.039	0.372	

Table 49: The R and r of CO standard measurement method.




Figure 49: The R and r of CO standard measurement method as a function of concentration.

O ₃ data (nmol/mol) without outliers			
group average	repeatability limit: r	reproducibility limit: R	reproducibility limit (relative)
-0.1		0.5	
17.2	0.2	0.7	
55.9	0.3	2.4	
92.2	0.6	3.6	
124.2	0.7	5.1	
152.8	1.3	7.5	4.9%

Table 50: The R and r of O₃ standard measurement method.




Figure 50: The R and r of O₃ standard measurement method as a function of concentration.

NO data (nmol/mol) without outliers			
group average	repeatability limit: r	reproducibility limit: R	reproducibility limit (relative)
0.1		0.9	
19.4	0.2	2.6	
29.8	0.8	2.3	
50.0	0.3	2.8	
80.0	1.2	4.4	
101.2	0.6	6.4	
215.5	1.4	7.9	
311.2	0.8	11.5	
403.3	2.0	13.6	
465.3	9.1	17.9	
618.0	2.5	24.2	3.9%

Table 51: The R and r of NO standard measurement method.




Figure 51: The R and r of NO standard measurement method as a function of concentration.

NO ₂ data (nmol/mol) without outliers			
group average	repeatability limit: r	reproducibility limit: R	reproducibility limit (relative)
0.0		1.0	
20.4	0.7	2.3	
61.0	0.3	3.4	
94.2	0.5	6.0	
114.7	0.5	5.4	
155.8	4.2	10.9	7.0%

Table 52: The R and r of NO₂ standard measurement method.




Figure 52: The R and r of NO₂ standard measurement method as a function of concentration.

Annex D. The scrutiny of results for consistency and outlier test

The precision evaluation (Annex C) focuses on data that are as much as possible the reflection of every day work of NRLs and thus represents the comparability of participant's standard operating procedures.

For that reason a procedure for the detection of exceptional errors (error during typing, slip in performing the measurement or the calculation, wrong averaging interval, malfunction of instrumentation, etc.) was applied. In this procedure were carried out tests for data consistency and statistical outliers as described in ISO 5725-2.

Laboratories showing some form of statistical inconsistency were requested to investigate the cause of discrepancies.

Laboratories were allowed to correct their results in case of identification of exceptional errors. Subsequently, data were considered definitive and "Grubb's one outlying observation test" was performed.

For runs where outliers were detected, outliers were removed and "Grubb's one outlying observation test" was repeated until no more outliers were observed. Statistical outliers obtained at this stage are not considered as extraordinary errors but due to significant difference in participant's standard operating procedure.

During this IE, only one statistical outlier, presented in the table below, was identified related to a CO level:

parameter	run	laboratory	measured value	failing test	confidence level
CO	0	A	-0.225	G1 minimum	1%, 5%

Table 53: "Genuine" statistical outliers according to Grubb's one outlying observation test.

The precision of standardized measurement methods reported in Annex C are calculated using the database without outliers.

According to Grubb's test, results between a confidence level of 1 and 5% are considered stragglers and they deserve a specific check.

In order to give useful information to the participants for judging their performance also the stragglers are reported in the following table:

Laboratory	parameter	run	value	Gmin_5%	Gmax_5%
A	CO	3	0.8593	Straggler	OK
C	CO	2	3.162	Straggler	OK
C	CO	4	4.711	Straggler	OK
E	SO ₂	5	11.547	OK	Straggler
L	NO ₂	8	90.19	Straggler	OK

Table 54: Stragglers according to Grubb's one observation test.

Annex E. Accreditation certificate



CERTIFICATO DI ACCREDITAMENTO Accreditation Certificate

Accreditamento n°
Accreditation n°

1362

Rev. 0

Si dichiara che
We declare that

**European Reference Laboratory for Air Pollution
(ERLAP) Air and Climate Unit - Institute for
Environment and Sustainability - Joint Research
Centre - European Commission**

Sede:
Via E. Fermi 2749 - 21027 Ispra VA

è conforme ai requisiti
della norma

UNI CEI EN ISO/IEC 17025:2005 "Requisiti generali per la competenza dei
Laboratori di prova e taratura"

meets the requirements
of the standard

EN ISO/IEC 17025:2005 "General Requirements for the Competence of Testing
and Calibration Laboratories" standard

quale

Laboratorio di Prova

as

Testing Laboratory

L'accreditamento attesta la competenza tecnica del Laboratorio relativamente allo scopo riportato nelle schede allegate al presente certificato. Le schede possono variare nel tempo. I requisiti gestionali della ISO/IEC 17025:2005 (sezione 4) sono scritti in un linguaggio idoneo all'attività dei Laboratori di Prova, sono conformi ai principi della ISO 9001:2008 ed allineati con i suoi requisiti applicabili. Il presente certificato non è da ritenersi valido se non accompagnato dalle schede allegate e può essere sospeso o revocato in qualsiasi momento nel caso di inadempienza accertata da parte di ACCREDIA. La validità dell'accreditamento può essere verificata sul sito WEB (www.accredia.it) o richiesta direttamente ai singoli Dipartimenti.

The accreditation certifies the technical competence of the laboratory limited to the scope detailed in the attached Enclosure. The scope may vary in the time. The management system requirements in ISO/IEC 17025:2005 (Section 4) are written in a language relevant to Testing Laboratories operations and meet the principles of ISO 9001:2008 and are aligned with its pertinent requirements. The present certificate is valid only if associated to the annexed schedule, and can be suspended or withdrawn at any time in the event of non fulfilment as ascertained by ACCREDIA. The in force status of the accreditation may be checked in the WEB site (www.accredia.it) or on direct request to appointed Department.

Data di 1ª emissione
1st issue date
2013-06-19

Data di modifica
Modification date
2013-06-19

Data di scadenza
Expiring date
2017-06-18


Il Direttore Generale
The General Director
(Dr. Filippo Trifiletti)


Il Direttore di Dipartimento
Department Director
(Dr. Paolo Bianco)


Il Presidente
The President
(Cav. del Lav. Federico Grazioli)



European Reference Laboratory for Air Pollution (ERLAP)
Air and Climate Unit - Institute for Environment and
Sustainability - Joint Research Centre - European
Commission

Via E. Fermi 2749
21027 Ispra VA

Numero di accreditamento: **1362** Sede **A**

Revisione: **0** Data: **22/07/2013**

Scheda **1** di **1** PA1779AR0.pdf

ELENCO PROVE ACCREDITATE - CATEGORIA: 0

Synthetic mixture gas

Denominazione della prova / Campi di prova

Metodo di prova

carbon monoxide (0-86 mmol/mol)

EN 14626:2012

nitrogen oxides (NO: 0-962 nmol/mol; NO₂: 0-261 nmol/mol)

EN 14211:2012

ozone (0-250 nmol/mol)

EN 14625:2012

sulphur dioxide (0-376 nmol/mol)

EN 14212:2012

Legenda

En= norma europea

ACCREDITIA
Il Direttore del Dipartimento
(Dr. Paolo Bianco)

Bianco
Paolo

Firmato digitalmente da Bianco Paolo
DN: c=IT, o=ACCREDITIA/10566361001,
cn=Bianco Paolo,
serialNumber=IT-SNCPLAS3M23L219N,
givenName=Paolo, sn=Bianco,
dnQualifier=11004771, title=Direttore
Dipartimento Laboratori di prova
Data: 2013.07.22 13:37:04 +02'00'

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union
Free phone number (*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11
(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.
It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu>

How to obtain EU publications

Our publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>),
where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents.
You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

JRC Mission

As the science and knowledge service of the European Commission, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to support EU policies with independent evidence throughout the whole policy cycle.



EU Science Hub

ec.europa.eu/jrc



@EU_ScienceHub



EU Science Hub - Joint Research Centre



Joint Research Centre



EU Science Hub